



REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION

Sherri Nichols, Chair | Susan Weston, Vice-Chair
Matthew Gliboff | Tara Van Niman
Denni Shefrin | Aparna Varadharajan

MINUTES

REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING Wednesday, November 2, 2022 - 7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Nichols.

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Nichols, Vice Chairperson Weston,
Commissioners Gliboff, Shefrin, Aparna, and Van Niman

Excused Absence: None

Staff Present: Seraphie Allen, Jeff Churchill, Glenn Coil, Kim Dietz,
Becky Frey, Philly Marsh, Planning Department; Chris
Wyatt, Executive Department

Recording Secretary: Carolyn Garza, LLC

2. Approval of the Agenda

- *MOTION to approve the agenda* by Commissioner Shefrin. MOTION seconded by Vice Chairperson Weston. *The MOTION passed unanimously.*

3. Approval of the Meeting Summary

- *MOTION to approve the October 26, 2022, agenda* by Vice Chairperson Weston. MOTION seconded by Commissioner Aparna. *The MOTION passed unanimously.*

4. Items from the Audience

Mr. Bob Yoder, Education Hill, thanked the Commission and stated that public notice should be encouraged on land use issues. Engagement is valuable for land uses, to work with the developer and staff on a timely basis to provide input.

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2022

5. Redmond Town Center (TWNC) Zoning Code Amendments (Public Hearing and Study Session) - Public hearing on proposed Redmond Zoning Code Text Amendments for Town Center Zone, to be followed by a study session.

Attachments: [Memo](#)
[Attachment A - issues matrix](#)
[Attachment B - Revised Subterranean Parking Language](#)
[Attachment C - Presentation](#)

Staff Contacts: [Glenn Coil](#), Senior Planner 425-556-2742

Staff Presentation

Mr. Coil introduced the topic.

Chairperson Nichols opened the Public Hearing.

Public Hearing

Ms. Kristina Hudson, CEO of OneRedmond, - 8383 - 158th Avenue Northeast, stated that OneRedmond is a partnership organization focused on economic development in Redmond, and is the combined chamber of commerce, community foundation, economic development, and community development enterprise for Redmond. As a representative of small businesses, non-profits and larger businesses, the value of the Redmond Town Center project and the vitality that will be brought to the community will be realized. In addition, the increase in density of residential and office is key to small business resiliency. Creating a mixed-use environment will help to increase foot traffic in restaurants and retail, also giving the community an opportunity to maximize the proximity of the new light rail station. As an economic development organization, OneRedmond knows that businesses make decisions regarding where to locate based on variables, two of which are quality of life and community vitality. Our region has seen enormous growth and more growth is coming. This project is a significant opportunity for the future of Redmond.

Mr. Bob Yoder, 10019 - 169th Avenue Northeast, stated that the future is now for Redmond Town Center, and that what is built today will set the stage for Nelson Village and the other ten owners. Redmond Town Center will someday be a regional destination and something to be proud of. There should be enormous public input. Critical benefits may significantly incent building heights such as covered common areas or plazas, supplementing the downtown park seasonally; live music, dancing, food for all cultures, play areas for children, a bi-annual community non-profit fair for inclusion, queer crosswalks, and artwork. Affordable housing and creative architecture and engineering are important. Views to reclaim the downtown ring of trees lost to the six story buildings and rooftop nightclub entertainment were other suggestions. Mr. Yoder stated that a copy of a written statement would be sent. Lastly, the twin nine-story tower at the old post office

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2022

site will be three stories less than the proposed at Redmond Town Center and interesting to see built.

Mr. Nick Mosher, 7405 - 168th Avenue Northeast, stated being excited about the project adding amenity options to the area within walking distance of residents and not requiring travel. The redevelopment is needed to revitalize the area. Town Center may not survive another ten years without a significant proportion of effort. Town Center should be the hub of Redmond. Changing the look and feel, adding to what already exists is important.

Ms. Dora Lee, representing Andrea Kim, owner of Lani's Tailor & Atelier in Town Center, stated that sales have grown exponentially since moving to the current location, and being in support of development and growth. Residents express excitement about proposed changes. Growth is always beneficial.

Mr. Patrick Woodruff, Hines (applicant) displayed a presentation giving additional context to the project issues matrix from the previous study session and design renderings. A project website has been created for feedback and outreach meetings have been held. Additional open houses will be conducted onsite.

Ms. Katie Kendall, land use counsel for the applicant, 701 - 5th Avenue, Seattle, stated that in response to Council comments, amendments were revised to only apply to the expanded mixed-use zone and reflect changes necessary to redevelop and revitalize the retail core. A minimum amount of retail in the core will be required to be retained through a development agreement. Under current code, hotel uses in Redmond Town Center are limited to eight stories and the code amendment increases occupiable floors to nine. The additional three stories are for parking above grade. Replacing surface parking is critical. An incentives table was displayed.

Ms. Rosemarie Ives (virtual), Northeast 98th Street, Redmond, stated that the Master Plan was and still is very important. The property owner was aware of the original Master Plan, the parameters of existing zoning, the high-water table, and limitations of infrastructure such as stormwater when purchased. Although city staff has an obligation to process the application, there is no guarantee that a request will be approved. Redmond needs to review with a critical eye what is best for residents and not developers. The city has a responsibility to facilitate a community process that would provide actual data on existing retail, commercial and housing. The greater context of downtown and the sub-context of Town Center must be considered together and only then can a new grand vision be created. Not having a vision or Master Plan is a serious omission in good public process. A twelve-story building with three stories of parking will bring in more cars for unneeded jobs and where most housing will be unaffordable. Recommendations from staff are premature without the Master Plan process. It is more important to preserve the remnants of the best of Redmond rather than to allow Redmond to become an experimental laboratory for developers and planners who do not live in Redmond and will not live with the consequences. It is time to do better, voting no until a Master Plan process occurs.

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2022

There were no further requests to speak. Chairperson Nichols stated that verbal comments were now closed, but that written comments would remain open. Chairperson Nichols noted that emails had been received from several parties.

- *Chairperson Nichols **closed the Public Hearing** for verbal testimony, but written testimony would remain open.*

Study Session

Chairperson Nichols opened with number one on the issues matrix, clarification regarding code amendments. Commissioner Aparna asked if the Hines timeline is accurate in terms of what the city expects for Redmond 2050. Mr. Coil replied that generally, yes, the timeline is accurate with some flexibility. There were no further questions and Chairperson Nichols closed the issue.

Number two on the issues matrix was regarding city council. Commissioner Weston complimented staff on the level of detail in the issues matrix reply and stated that the Issue could be closed.

Number three on the issues matrix was regarding future redevelopment. Commissioner Aparna asked if additional review meetings could be required where more public input could be received. Mr. Coil replied that a change to the zoning code would be necessary. Mr. Churchill clarified a comment by Mr. Coil regarding the Design Review Board by stating that meetings are public but not televised. The Design Review Board does not recommend a project for approval until the project meets code requirements, and as many meetings as needed occur. Commissioners Shefrin and Weston stated being satisfied. Chairperson Nichols stated that the Master Plan and Development Agreements still move through city council and that there are many opportunities for public engagement. The Issue was closed.

Number four on the issues matrix was regarding development regulations. Commissioner Aparna asked if the incentive package for the project could be codified if consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Mr. Coil replied correct. Commissioner Aparna asked if references to LEED standards are not codified and Mr. Coil replied not as part of the Climate Emergency Declaration, but as part of the adopted Environmental Sustainability Action Plan. Mr. Churchill clarified that LEED Silver is what was referred to by the Council in the Climate Emergency Declaration, but not existing in code. Commissioner Aparna explained the LEED process and stated that the project would receive many points because of proximity to public transit and location. By complying with minimum State code, more points will be received with little effort. The comment could be written out and submitted to the Commission. A project score is needed in all categories, not only categories already scoring high before construction has begun. Chairperson Nichols stated that the Environmental Sustainability Action Plan rather than the Climate Emergency Declaration should be prioritized. Mr. Churchill replied that the Environmental Sustainability Action Plan does not have a standard set for new private construction in the

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2022

same way that the Climate Emergency Declaration does. Both were adopted at the same time and should be consistent with each other. Comprehensive Plan policy indicates that incentives should look at green, sustainable building. The Climate Emergency Declaration provides a publicly-available declaration of Council intent. The Planning Commission is not required to recommend the standard. Chairperson Nichols asked if the Planning Commission could recommend a different path if the standard does not meet the intent, and Mr. Churchill replied yes. Commissioner Aparna stated that the intent of green building must be met, foreshadowing Redmond 2050 in some way, and stated being satisfied with closing the topic. Chairperson Nichols stated that an open topic remained, a request for more information regarding the relationship between the Plan and Declaration and suggested adding as an additional and separate Issue. The issue was closed.

Number five on the issues matrix was regarding parking at Town Center related to then leaving on foot for other destinations. Commissioner Weston stated appreciating the level of information provided. Parking validation works in Bellevue from a consumer perspective but here there will still be many cars present. Parking clarifications by Hines have been helpful. Chairperson Nichols closed the Issue.

Number six on the issues matrix was regarding access to the light rail station. Commissioner Gliboff added to the list of access options by Mr. Coil that a large park-and-ride is to be built next to the Marymoor Village Station and a dedicated station park-and-ride should not be necessary in Downtown. Commissioner Weston replied that many of the park-and-ride spaces will be reservable for commuters, so there may still be a challenge without a dedicated, reserved space. There will be tension and competition for parking. Chairperson Nichols closed the Issue.

Chairperson Nichols stated that one new issue had been added to the issues matrix.

Commissioner Aparna asked for clarification that parking incentives include EV charging and parking and asked if a business continuity plan will be part of a development agreement.

Commissioner Shefrin asked if there would be ownership opportunities as opposed to rentals in Redmond Town Center. Mr. Churchill replied that ownership housing is more expensive for a developer to include than rental affordable housing in prior experience. The expectation is that without an ownership incentive, the most likely result will be rental housing. Commissioner Shefrin stated that the term affordable is being referred to as simply market rate.

Commissioner Aparna asked what will happen to the Archer Hotel, a relatively new building. Mr. Coil replied that the applicant could provide a response to that question.

6. Redmond 2050 - Overlake Regulations (study session): continued study session on proposed amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code (RZC) for Overlake.

Attachments: [Memo](#)
[Attachment A - Draft Development Standards Table](#)
[Attachment B - Presentation Slides](#)

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2022

Staff Contact: [Becky Frey](#), Principal Planner 425-556-2750
[Lauren Alpert](#), Senior Planner 425-556-2460

Staff Presentation

Ms. Frey presented the topic, International District.

Commissioner Aparna stated that whatever is done should be flexible as culture and demographics change. The only exclusions should be what is unacceptable such as hate symbols, for the design standard as well. Public art and performances could include cultural education.

Commissioner Shefrin stated agreement with Commissioner Aparna and suggested a recognized cultural council, involving stakeholders. Ms. Frey replied that staff are attempting to find ways to support businesses while having community-based maintenance. The Arts and Cultural Commission could be the group to develop ideas for code updates. Reviews of the area will be different and require training of Board members and Commissioners. Commissioner Shefrin stated that the subject would be an ongoing conversation.

Commissioner Gliboff stated that the development will not be a perfect process but rather iterative requiring reflection. Ongoing engagement with the community will be needed. Ms. Frey replied that the idea of success from the community and not from the city is what is desired.

Commissioner Weston stated that OneRedmond could be a model for engagement in an International District and stated that space should be available to rent to celebrate and promote culture. Ms. Frey replied that the idea is being folded into Use Chart updates. The Park, Arts, Recreation, Culture, and Conservation (PARCC) Plan Update can be included regarding a large new park being developed in the same area.

Commissioner Van Niman asked if streets shown on a map are major thoroughfares as streets for festivals should be able to be closed off. Ms. Frey replied that the idea is being examined for a street that could be designated a festival street. Commissioner Van Niman suggested an arch at an entryway or something else to designate the space.

Commissioner Gliboff asked if incentives or grants relevant to the community could be discussed.

Commissioner Aparna stated liking the idea of smaller festival streets closed off, but that there could be two different events occurring on the same day. Sharing the common resource will need to be examined. Ms. Frey replied that other locations are being researched for times with multiple events. Commissioner Aparna stated that an ongoing neighborhood Council makes sense, a common space where potential challenges such as language barriers can be resolved. Ms. Frey replied that an organization could be responsible for the management and activation of spaces.

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2022

Ms. Frey continued the presentation with Incentives.

Commissioner Van Niman asked, regarding incentivizing spaces, for clarification that there is a body at city permitting that would control business allowed to operate. Ms. Frey replied no, that in theory a program would be in place to review development. If a program is in a proposal, the project would earn points towards incentives. Commissioner Van Niman asked for clarification that points would be awarded as the new space is being built, and Ms. Frey replied yes. Commissioner Van Niman asked what would prevent the takeover of a space, and Ms. Frey replied that this is the reason that multiple types of incentives, programs, and active partnerships are tools. Commissioner Van Niman asked if back-end issues would be discussed later, and Ms. Frey replied that staff still needs to determine a starting point and the key objectives and resources of partners in play. Commissioner Van Niman asked for clarification that the mechanism exists that the city has a right to control a created district. Ms. Frey replied that the city has a right to develop an incentive program that, if participated in voluntarily, will earn extra points. The city does not have the right to control if a business can be in a spot or not. Commissioner Van Niman asked how much control the city would have after 20 years. Chairperson Nichols stated that there is a structure in place for, in example, affordable housing and the same could be done for affordable commercial. Ms. Frey replied that staff is in the process of determining long term affordable commercial ideas. Different types of support should be available for different types of businesses. Non-profit organizations or an entity such as OneRedmond may become involved.

Commissioner Shefrin asked what the overall square footage at build-out would be. Ms. Frey replied that numbers are being run at this time. Commissioner Shefrin asked if allocation, in example no less than 12,000 square feet for restaurant space, would be considered. Ms. Frey replied that in the past, Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R). refinements were adopted in the code update, and feedback is that this is difficult from a developer perspective. Other feedback is that the city needs to facilitate adaptive reuse, not managing the use but managing the building so that the use can evolve over time. The incentive program is taking the place of set allocation. Commissioner Shefrin asked for clarification regarding accruing points and Ms. Frey explained the incentive point process.

Commissioner Aparna asked if a market bazaar would be allowed in the International District. Ms. Frey replied that food related requests are going to be included and definitions of food and beverage are being examined.

Commissioner Van Niman asked for clarification that a market bazaar would be central and authentic, with stands selling items that could not be sold through as a storefront and not necessarily food. Ms. Frey replied liking the idea and that considerably more incentive points could be awarded for features the city wants to see built.

Ms. Frey stated that any other ideas can be emailed. Among next steps will be pinpointing use-based conversations, preparing incentive drafts and code framework, and community and stakeholder engagement. Specific questions are regarding 100% impervious surfaces,

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2022

regarding the minimum amount of growth needed to achieve density, and regarding rear end sidewalk setbacks.

Commissioner Weston asked what happens to water in a storm in a 100% impervious situation. Ms. Frey replied that regional stormwater facilities are connected to, not onsite. Commissioner Weston asked where the water would go. Mr. Churchill replied that stormwater in Overlake mainly goes to Kelsey Creek. Underneath a parking lot there is a detention vault to control flow. Other regional vaults have no bottoms and water goes directly into the ground. Commissioner Weston stated that Bellevue has had major drainage issues in the past and asked what implications could be with 100% impervious rather than managing some water onsite. Ms. Frey replied that in the area, there is not an ability to manage onsite due to soil. It is better stormwater management to use the regional facility from a soil perspective. Commissioner Weston asked if regional facilities need to be larger than currently planned due to increased growth. Ms. Frey replied that infrastructure impacts would be identified. Mr. Churchill replied that the expectation is that demand on stormwater would increase minimally and that there may be a combination of connection to the regional system for part of drainage and infiltrating the rest on site. Ms. Frey replied that the stormwater utility may be interested in Purple Pipe recycling.

Commissioner Aparna stated that the back end of many urban environments are not managed well and garbage, unsightly issues due to density need to be planned for.

Commissioner Van Niman stated that a question posed by staff was not understood and that pictures would be helpful. Ms. Frey replied that the questions can be revisited at a later meeting and that staff would gather more information.

Ms. Frey stated that the testing phase is beginning with community stakeholders. A public hearing is planned for spring 2023. A code package will be available for review in months.

➤ *Discussion only. No action taken.*

7. DRAFT Economic Vitality Element - Draft 2 (Study Session): staff will provide an update on the second draft of the Economic Vitality Element as part of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan Update.

Attachments: [Memo](#)
[Attachment A - Economic Vitality Element - issues matrix](#)

Staff Contact: [Glenn Coil](#), Senior Planner 425-556-2742

Staff Presentation

Mr. Coil introduced the new Economic Development Manager, Philly Marsh.

Mr. Coil gave the last presentation.

Regarding number one on the issues matrix, Business Districts, Commissioner Van Niman asked for clarification that an example of a business district is what has been discussed,

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2022

and Mr. Coil replied for Overlake, correct. Mx. Allen replied that the business district would support businesses but framed more around a cultural theme and expectation. Commissioner Van Niman asked for clarification that the businesses desired to be attracted determine the district and Mx. Allen replied that, in example, the Seattle International District contains cultural art and placemaking overlay related to celebrating the historic immigrants established there as well as crossover businesses. Chairperson Nichols stated that the issue could be closed.

Regarding item number two, Smart Cities, Chairperson Nichols stated that surveillance is a concern. Commissioner Gliboff stated objecting to the issue even more strongly at this time, as privacy concerns have not been addressed and that similar privatization of public services had been abandoned after concerns in Toronto, Canada. Commissioner Gliboff proposed that there be language that strongly limits the degree that private companies can play or simply striking the policy. Commissioner Weston stated that sensors have value, but that policy should be written thoughtfully around them. Chairperson Nichols replied that it is hard to know where risks are and that sensors represent data that can be combined with other data to establish where a person has been. Commissioner Weston stated that the scenario happens, but sensors are not necessarily tagged to people but rather assets and stated seeing both the value and privacy concerns. Commissioner Aparna stated agreement with Commissioner Gliboff and that the value will be in the management of utilities, in example, the Puget Sound Energy Smart Meters. Using sensors as a planning tool at the highest level versus at a utility level can be considered. Privacy concerns related to cameras and individual behavior is understood, but to manage the back end such as stormwater and water quality has value. The policy could also be struck. Commissioner Van Niman stated that if there are to be exclusions, intentions may need to specifically be laid out. Commissioner Gliboff stated that the technology is not intrinsically bad, in example, Police body cameras. Opposition is to a broad approval of Smart Cities technology. New technologies should be considered as emerging and not excluded at this time to upgrade systems in the future. The issue is which entity will have access to data and how the data is stored. The current process should continue, not including the proposed policy. Chairperson Nichols stated agreement with Commissioner Gliboff, and that allowing smart technologies should be on a case-by-case basis which the proposed policy would not allow. Commissioner Weston asked if Redmond has a standard process to evaluate Smart City projects. Mr. Coil replied not knowing the answer, and that the Smart City conversation is related to growth management and the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Aparna asked if the term Smart Cities could be replaced with encourage city planning to use technology to increase efficiency while keeping individual privacy in mind, and for city infrastructure. Mr. Coil replied that the city being proactive in modernization improves quality of life and is attractive from an economic vitality perspective. The term Smart Cities may imply some negative implications. Commissioner Gliboff stated that a policy is not needed that states technology is always good. Decisions regarding technology will go forward regardless of a policy such as proposed. If the point is quality of life, the proposed policy is not relevant. Better, more reliable, and robust services and not simply efficiency should be the goal. Mr. Coil stated that Smart Cities are addressed in Transportation, Utilities and Capital Facilities elements elsewhere and

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2022

possibly Housing. Commissioner Weston asked for clarification regarding air quality sensors in the event of another wildfire event, or seismic sensors for earthquakes, and Mr. Coil replied that these would not be covered in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Churchill replied that air quality can be argued to be important to the health of a city. Commissioner Gliboff stated that any policies written can be assumed to include adding technologies, and a policy is not needed which states that technology is good. Chairperson Nichols added that technology can preserve and enhance local arts, cultural recreation, night life, social amenities and promote a distinct identity for Redmond. Mx. Allen replied that city Council has directed the TIS Director to imagine broad Smart Cities technology ideas, in example, around Business Licenses, but that the umbrella term of Smart Cities is understood to be of concern.

Commissioner Gliboff stated that technologies should be opted in one at a time, democratically, and being uncomfortable of the broadness of an umbrella policy.

Commissioner Aparna stated that privacy and transparency of data must be incorporated into the policy if the policy were to be put into place. A resident must be able to access owned personal data at any time. Commissioner Aparna stated being okay with not having the policy, also.

Commissioner Shefrin asked if a statement could be included that an adverse impact assessment would be performed before a technology is implemented.

Chairperson Nichols stated that the Commission would not be able to resolve language. City Council has expressed that the policy should be adopted.

Commissioner Van Niman stated that staff should have the ability to make decisions regarding installing sensors in a way that fits within the budget without Council approval. Ms. Frey replied that items are added to utility poles, an investment that does require Council approval. Commissioner Shefrin asked if Council would be involved if within staff budget, and Ms. Frey replied that if not allocated as a part of the budget, Council is involved, and a policy would be needed related to the situation. Mr. Churchill replied that staff must work within the framework adopted by the city Council. Chairperson Nichols stated that the city does budgeting by priorities. Commissioner Van Niman asked for clarification about when there is not a specific policy to address a situation. Mr. Coil replied that when there is no clear guidance, what can be done is not clear. Ms. Frey replied that staff would be unlikely to monitor in this way without a broader discussion but can be researched. Commissioner Van Niman stated that new technology at this time will be normal in five to ten years.

Commissioner Aparna stated that minimal safeguards can be added that can become specific safeguards later. Mr. Churchill replied that input had been very helpful towards a final draft.

➤ *Discussion only. No action taken.*

Redmond Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2022

8. Staff & Commissioner Updates

Mr. Coil stated that the November 9, 2022, meeting will be a diversity training session. The November 16, 2022, meeting will be a study session for Redmond Town Center. Mr. Churchill stated that growth management had been an intended topic at the last retreat, but time had run out, so if there is time on November 16, 2022, or December 7, 2022, the topic will be on the Agenda.

➤ *Discussion only. No action taken.*

9. Adjourn - 9:47pm

➤ *MOTION to adjourn* by Vice Chairperson Weston. MOTION seconded by Commissioner Van Niman. *The MOTION passed unanimously.*

Minutes approved on:

December 7, 2022

Planning Commission Chair

DocuSigned by:

Sherrri Melhols

816CD0A1D16A46D...